

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application, new claims 10 and 11 having been added as indicated herein. Claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Haverstock *et al.* (U.S. Patent No.: 6,434,607) in view of Papierniak *et al.* (U.S. Patent No.: 6,151,601).

§112, second paragraph, Rejections - Claims 2, 3, 6 and 7

The Examiner rejects claims 2, 3, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant amends claims 2, 3, 6, and 7, as indicated herein, and believes that these amendments obviate the Examiner's rejections of claims 2, 3, 6, and 7.

§103(a) Rejections - Claims 1-9

Claims 1-9 are rejected over Haverstock in view of Papierniak, for the reasons set forth on pages 2-5 of the present Office Action.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that the applied references, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest at least "(c) converting the extracted data into a format suited for a destination server by referring to a mapping table for storing mapping relationships, said mapping relationships are determined by the environments of the source server and the destination server; and," as recited in claim 1. The above quoted feature of claim 1 describes that the conversion of extracted data into a format suited for a destination server is performed by referring to a mapping table for storing mapping relationships and the mapping relationships are determined by the environments of the source server and the destination server.

The Examiner cites column 4, lines 32-35 of Haverstock as allegedly satisfying the above quoted limitation, however, neither the cited portion of Haverstock nor any other portion of Haverstock discloses that a mapping table for storing mapping relationships is referred to, for the purpose of converting extracted data into a format suited for a destination server. Yet, further, nowhere does Haverstock describe that mapping relationships are determined by the environments of the source server and the destination server.

Yet even further, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine Haverstock with Papierniak, to arrive at the present invention. Haverstock is exclusively directed to a system for enabling access to non-html and html files from a web browser. In fact, all of the objects of Haverstock, as set forth in the Summary of the Invention section of Haverstock, relate in some way to gaining access to html and non-html documents within a system using a browser. That is, Haverstock appears to desire to access documents for the purpose of displaying the accessed documents. On the other hand, Papierniak appears to be related to collecting, analyzing, and/or transforming data for the purpose of loading the data into a database. In other words, Papierniak appears to be related to the storage, not display, of retrieved or accessed data. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine Haverstock with Papierniak.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination. Applicant submits that independent claim 4 is patentable over the applied references at least for reasons similar for those set forth above, as claim 4 recites limitations similar to independent claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 3, and 5-7 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claims 1 and 4, respectively.

With respect to independent claim 8, Applicant submits that neither of the applied references teaches or suggest at least, “a mapping table for mapping home page data stored in a source server into home page data to be stored in a destination server based on the environments of a common gateway interface (CGI), a database, a bulletin board of the source server, and a bulletin board of the destination server,” as recited in claim 8. As similarly argued above with respect to claim 1, Haverstock does not even teach or suggest a mapping table, as described in claim 8. Yet further, Haverstock does not describe environments of a common gateway interface, a database, a bulletin board of the source server, and a bulletin board of the destination server, which are all the basis for mapping home page data stored in a source server into homepage data to be stored in a destination server, according to claim 8. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, we would argue that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

Applicant submits that dependent claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency of independent claim 8.

Finally, Applicant adds new claims 10 and 11 to round out the scope of protection solicited for the present invention. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their direct and indirect dependency from independent claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 29, 2004